

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF NEW HAMPSHIRE**

Daniel E. Hall, Plaintiff,
v.
Twitter Inc., Defendant.

Case No. 1:20-cv-536-SE

PLAINTIFF'S MOTION TO STRIKE TWITTER'S DOC. 3 MOTION TO DISMISS

Daniel E. Hall, "Plaintiff" "Motions" this court to strike any "refiled" Doc. 3 Motion to Dismiss and MOL because these pleadings were filed by non-bar member, Julie "Schwartz", and because the motion was submitted in participation with the fraud being perpetrated upon the Court through Magistrate Judge Johnstone's illegal policies, both being prejudicial to the Plaintiff. Defendant has been contacted and does not assent to the relief sought through this Motion.

I. Pleadings by Non-Bar Members

1. Ms. Schwartz's "unauthorized practice of law" in representing and submitting to the Court on behalf of a corporate client, [Doc. 3, 3.1], prior to being admitted by the Court and prior to taking the oath prescribed in N.H. RSA 311:6 and in violation of N.H. RSA 311:7, ABA Rule 5.5(c)(2) and LR 83.1, and should be stricken from the record, or not be allowed to be re-filed as it is an illegal document which is scandalous and non-conforming.

II. Participation of Fraud Upon the Court

2. Starting on April 26, 2018, Magistrate Judge “Johnstone” was, on a continuous basis, intentionally ignoring N.H. law and established official court pro hac vice rules, and instead promulgated, implemented, managed and adopted her own non-public alternative admission procedures, within her administrative case management duties, that make pro hac vice laws and rule provisions unnecessary and for the specific reason of, allowing partner attorneys from the law firm of Perkins Coie, LLP. “COIE”, “Mrazik” and “Schwartz”, the privilege of practicing before the Court although they lacked the requirements of eligibility set forth in Local Rule “LR” 83.2, and in violation of N.H.RSA 311:7, all to the benefit of the defendant, Twitter.

For the reasons stated herein, and in the attached memorandum of law, this Court must declare Twitter's Doc. 3 Motion to Dismiss and MOL to be prejudicial to the Plaintiff and in violation of N.H. RSA 311:7, ABA Rule 5.5(c)(2) and LR 83.1, and is illegal and therefore scandalous and therefore an insufficient defense under Fed.R.Civ.P. 12(f) and therefore, must be stricken or void(ed) from the record in its entirety. Also, as the Doc. 3 Motion and MOL submitted by Twitter was part thereof the fraud upon the Court successfully perpetrated in part by Twitter and Twitter should not otherwise benefit from the fraud upon the court, nor should the court rely on a document with employs the scheme of fraud perpetrated, which would clearly prejudice the Plaintiff's federal and state constitutional rights of equal protection and due process of the laws.

Respectfully,

/s/ Daniel E. Hall
Aka, Sensa Verogna
SensaVerogna@gmail.com

"I declare, certify, verify and state declare pursuant to U.S. 28 U.S Code 1746 and under penalty of perjury that the foregoing is true and correct. Signed this 27th day of October 2022 in the State of New Hampshire.


Daniel E. Hall

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that on this 27th day of October 2022, the foregoing document was made upon the Defendant, through its attorneys of record to Jonathan M. Eck jeck@orr-reno.com and Julie E. Schwartz, Esq., JSchwartz@perkinscoie.com and Indraneel Sur, Lead Attorney. U.S. DOJ, indraneel.sur@usdoj.gov